

ANALI ZAVODA ZA POVIJESNE ZNANOSTI HAZU U DUBROVNIKU - PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

The publication of an article in a peer-reviewed *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society.

Any complaints regarding any material published in the journal should be directly sent to the Editor-in-Chief (nella.lonza@gmail.com).

DUTIES OF AUTHORS

Reporting standards

Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain all the references to permit others to locate and consult the sources on which the work is based. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Multiple or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. Publication of some kinds of articles (e.g. translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justifiable, provided certain conditions are met. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given by means of notes written according to bibliographical standards. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit permission from the source, and the acknowledgement should be made clearly. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

Authorship of the paper

All those who have made significant contributions to the paper should be listed as co-authors.

Appeal against the editorial decision

The authors have the right to appeal against any editorial decision. A statement with rebuttal should be sent directly to the Editor-in-Chief.

DUTIES OF EDITORS

Criteria

Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the edition. Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, and the relevance to the history of Dubrovnik and its area.

Publication decisions

The editors of *Dubrovnik Annals* are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. In doing so, they follow the procedure established by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions.

Peer review

All manuscripts will be subject to a well-established, fair, unbiased peer review and refereeing procedure of at least two reviewers, and are considered on the basis of their significance, novelty and relevance to the topic of the journal. The review output will be: accepted, subject to revision, or rejected. A paper once rejected will not be considered again for review. The review process may take approximately 9 months to be completed. For accepted paper, should authors be requested by the editor to revise the text, the revised version should be submitted within 1 month, unless otherwise agreed.

Fair play

The editors should give manuscripts for evaluation with regard to their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

The confidentiality of the peer-review process

All editors should ensure that material submitted to the journal remains confidential while under review.

Conflicts of interest

Editors will make fair and unbiased decisions independent of commercial considerations, and should ensure a fair and appropriate peer-review process. Editors will recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors or institutions connected to the papers. When deciding upon the reviewers, editors will take in consideration any risk of conflict of interest.

Unethical publishing

When ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, or when they receive notice of the questionable publishing behavior, the

editors will discuss and take all the appropriate measures to investigate the claim, even if it is discovered years after publication.

DUTIES OF REVIEWERS

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer-review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer-review is an essential component of scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. *Dubrovnik Annals* shares the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

Conflict of interest

Reviewers should notify the editors and recuse themselves from the review process in any case of conflict of interest regarding the author, topic, etc.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Besides on the already established editorial practice, these guidelines are based on:

<http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights>

http://www.publicationethics.org/files/u2/Best_Practice.pdf.